

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 6, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1, 4-10, 12-17, 20-24, 26-29, 31, 32, 34-37 and 39-43 are now pending in this Application.

Claim(s) 1, 17, 31-32, 34-35 and 39 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 17, 31-32, 34-35, 37 and 39 have been amended. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-8, 15-16, 32, 34, 35 and 39-43 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being obvious over Woodmansee (Pub. No. 2002/0178140) and Yankovsky (Pub. No. 2004/0117381). Referring first to Yankovsky '381, the Office Action points to Yankovsky '381, stating specifically that Yankovsky '381 teaches the memory saving aspect by controlling by a cache responsive to a controller [0023]. The claimed configuration of Claim 1, however, does not control the amount of memory, but rather reduces the memory required by optimizing the operations to perform in as small a memory footprint as feasible based on the filter criteria. In other words, the claimed method does not proactively determine required memory and then request it; rather it simply makes efficient use of available memory by examining only deterministic fields in the first pass (those fields examined in the search), and including only (entire) records in the second pass from those records tagged in the first pass.

Yankovsky '381 includes values in a cache for selective recall. Yankovsky does not show, teach or disclose a filtering criteria operable on a portion (fields) of an entry for tagging the entry as inclusive for the second pass. Rather, Yankovsky caches called-for values in a cache up to the limit of the cache [0028], and does not examine or cache portions of entries or values in order to conserve memory, in contrast to Claim 1. Values are either cached or

not cached based on priority [0030], and no caching or fetching of a portion of a value or record is performed. Claim 1 manipulates only a portion of each entry on the first pass, manipulating whole records in the second pass. The Yankovsky second pass manipulates the same values as the first pass. Therefore, in the Yankovsky second pass, the same values examined in the first pass are again, examined and processed (i.e. written). In contrast, the claimed approach writes entire entries in a second pass from which only a portion of the entries were fetched on the first pass.

Accordingly, Yankovsky makes no showing, teaching, or disclosure of processing only a portion of each parsed entry, as discussed at page 8, line 28- page 9, line 16. No showing teaching, or disclosure of a filtering criteria indicative of the portion to be parsed is shown in Yankovsky '381. Further, the portion parsed based on the filtering criteria is the portion of the entry that is deterministic to inclusion in the second pass. Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 4 to recite retaining in a memory, in the first pass, only the selection and arrangement criteria fields, as disclosed at page 5, lines 12-15, and further to clarify that defining the portion as fields in the entries [is] deterministic of the entries in the output records, as discussed at page 15, lines 20-27. Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted as allowable because neither Woodmansee '140 nor Yankovsky '381 show, teach or disclose the claimed portion and filtering criteria as clarified by the above amendments.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Yankovsky '381 to modify Woodmansee '140 because Woodmansee discloses a GUI application for database queries operable by an end-user, while Yankovsky '381 teaches an XML/script based tool for manipulating source code. Therefore, while Woodmansee teaches a GUI appealing to a non-technical end user, Yankovsky '381 teaches intricate details of script language processing employed by a software engineer or other highly technical personnel.

Continuing with Woodmansee '140, Woodmansee is cited for the proposition of teaching the claimed selection criteria and arrangement criteria. While Woodmansee '140 disclosed multiple filters, as in successive applications [0003], Woodmansee does not show, teach or suggest the claimed selection criteria and arrangement criteria. The Woodmansee teachings merely suggest a series of unrelated filters applicable to the same data set. In contrast, the claimed selection criteria examines portions, or subsets, of data items, while the arrangement criteria looks to the selection criteria to cause fetching of the entire (non-portioned) data item for the same data items tagged by the selection criteria (page 12, lines 1-10). The claimed approach differs because the Woodmansee disclosure makes no connection or dependency between successive filters.

Claim 17 has been further rejected on similar grounds, and further with respect to Jamshidi '497. Jamshidi teaches a spreadsheet model which distinctly differs from the claimed data set because such a spreadsheet includes only fields for visible display. In contrast, the claimed data set includes fields for output display and fields for determining entries for inclusion, as determined by the claimed filtering criteria and selection criteria, respectively. Jamshidi makes no showing, teaching, or disclosure of the claimed filtering criteria AND selection criteria. One of skill in the art would not look to Jamshidi to modify Woodmansee because Jamshidi is concerned with spreadsheet calculations and Woodmansee teaches database operations. Further, any such combination would still not yield the claimed filtering criteria AND selection criteria. Accordingly, Claim 17 has been similarly amended as Claim 1. Claims 31, 32, 34, 35 and 39, rejected on similar grounds, have been likewise amended.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 17, 31, 35 and 39, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this

-18-

response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/CJL/

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-21(03115)

Dated: December 5, 2007